

80



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,116	02/14/2001	Garth F. Schmeling	10001605-1	3838

7590 01/06/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,116

Applicant(s)

SCHMELING ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. No claim for priority has been made in this application.

The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 2/14/2001.

Response to Amendment

2. The **affidavit** filed on 09/24/2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Jevans reference (Patent Number: US-2001/0055396 A1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15 – 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rusnak (Patent Number: 6098056), hereinafter referred to as Rusnak.

As per claims 1, 13 and 20, Rusnak teaches a method for sharing a document including the steps of:

using a client machine to access a server via a network and to request data therefrom (Rusnak: see for example, Abstract Line 1 – 4);

encrypting at least a portion of said data on said server (Rusnak: see for example, Abstract Line 6);

communicating said encrypted data from said server to said client (Rusnak: see for example, Column 5 Line 2 – 3 and Column 5 Line 24 – 27); and

decrypting said data on said client (Rusnak: see for example, (Rusnak: see for example, Column 5 Line 24 – 27).

As per claims 6 and 19, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claims 1 and 13 respectively). Rusnak further teaches customizing data based on a user's access rights (Rusnak: see for example, Column 1 Line 16 – 20).

As per claim 7, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak further teaches providing for secure modification of said shared document (Rusnak: see for example, Column 1 Line 16 – 20).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 15, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 13). Rusnak further teaches said first means includes a first applet residing on said server (Rusnak: see for example, Column 5 Line 2 – 3: encrypted digital content).

As per claim 16, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 15). Rusnak further teaches said second means includes a second applet residing on said client (Rusnak: see for example, Column 5 Line 24 – 27: encrypted digital content).

As per claim 17, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 16). Rusnak further teaches including means for transferring said second applet from said server to said client (Rusnak: see for example, Column 5 Line 2 – 3 and Column 5 Line 24 – 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2131

4. Claims 2 – 5, 8, 11, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rusnak (Patent Number: 6098056), hereinafter referred to as Rusnak, in view of Smithies (Patent Number: US 6091835 B1), hereinafter referred to as Smithies.

5. As per claims 2 and 18, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1 and 13 respectively). Rusnak does not disclose expressly the step of verifying a user's identity.

Smithies teaches the step of verifying a user's identity (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 7 – 12).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Smithies within the system of Rusnak because Smithies teaches a method permitting authorized applications to access signature verification module to vilify electronic signatures such as those which are based on biometric data (e.g., digitized handwritten signatures) (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 7 – 12).

As per claim 3, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 2). Rusnak as modified further teaches the step of verifying a user's identity includes the step of authenticating a digital signature (e.g., digitized handwritten signatures) (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 7 – 12) and

Art Unit: 2131

(Applicant Admitted Prior-Art (2002/0112164): Page 2 Paragraph [0026]: Examiner notes this is just presented for further evidences).

As per claim 4, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 2). Rusnak as modified teaches the step of verifying a user's identity includes the step of authenticating a private key (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 7 – 12) and (Applicant Admitted Prior-Art (2002/0112164): Page 2 Paragraph [0026]: Examiner notes this is just presented for further evidences).

As per claim 5, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 2). Rusnak as modified teaches the step of verifying a user's identity includes the step of authenticating a public key (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 7 – 12) and (Applicant Admitted Prior-Art (2002/0112164): Page 2 Paragraph [0026]: Examiner notes this is just presented for further evidences).

As per claim 8, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not disclose expressly verifying a user's identity includes including the step of tracking changes in said document.

Smithies teaches verifying a user's identity includes including the step of tracking changes in said document (Smithies: see for example, Column 41 Line 32 – 35). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 2.

As per claim 11, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not disclose expressly viewing said data on said client.

Smithies teaches viewing said data on said client (Smithies: see for example, Column 42 Line 1 – 14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Smithies within the system of Rusnak because Smithies teaches a method to provide a web server that can respond to document requests from a web browser and internet is the widely used well-known technology.

As per claim 12, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak as does not disclose expressly viewing said data on said client via a browser.

Smithies teaches viewing said data on said client via a browser (Smithies: see for example, Column 42 Line 1 – 14). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 11.

6. Claims 9 – 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rusnak (Patent Number: 6098056), hereinafter referred to as Rusnak,, in view of Haverstock (Patent Number: US 6449640 B1), hereinafter referred to as Haverstock.

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 9, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not teach tracking access of said document.

Haverstock teaches tracking access of said document (Haverstock: see for example, Column 7 Line 10 – 13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Haverstock within the system of Rusnak because (a) Haverstock teaches a method to provide a web server that can respond to document requests from a web browser and internet is the widely used well-known technology and (b) Haverstock also discloses the advantages of using automated work flow process through internet web browser (Haverstock: see for example, Column 6 Line 49 – 51 and Column 6 Line 61 – 67).

As per claim 10, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not teach tracking submission of documents.

Haverstock teaches tracking submission of documents (Haverstock: see for example, Column 10 Line 10 – 11). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 9.

As per claim 11, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not teach viewing said data on said client.

Art Unit: 2131

Haverstock teaches viewing said data on said client (Haverstock: see for example, Column 2 Line 37 – 44). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 9.

As per claim 12, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Rusnak does not teach viewing said data on said client via a browser.

Haverstock teaches viewing said data on said client via a browser (Haverstock: see for example, Column 2 Line 37 – 44). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 9.

As per claim 14, Rusnak teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 13). Rusnak does not teach including an agent residing on said server.

Haverstock teaches including an agent residing on said server (Haverstock: see for example, Column 4 Line 36 and Column 6 Line 63). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 9.

Art Unit: 2131

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LBC

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131



AU2131
12/29/04